

REMARKS

Claim 11 has been amended. Claim 10 has been canceled without prejudice. Claims 2-9, and 11-15 remain in the application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested. The Examiner's comments are shown in bold.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 2-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(b) as being unpatentable over Launey et al (5,086,385).

Claim 10 has been canceled without prejudice, since the broadcast of an audio message is taught by Launey et. al.

Regarding Claims 2-9, and 11-15, the Applicant most respectfully traverses the position of the Examiner as is discussed below:

Regarding Claims 2-9, and 11-15:

Claims 2-9, and 11-15 each contain the limitation:

a plurality of local units connected to said central control unit;

each of said plurality of local units having a plurality of input trips and a plurality of programmable responses thereto;

Launey et. al does not teach or suggest such limitations. Items 26 and 26a of Launey et. al comprise process controllers for switching control devices, not a plurality of local warning system units. The Launey et. al processor controllers do not teach or suggest that they contain a plurality of input trips and programmable responses. Therefore, in accordance with MPEP 2142 and 2143.03, the Applicant submits that a *prima facie* case for obviousness has not been made: As such, the Applicant submits that Claims 2-9, and 11-15 should be allowable.

Further, Claims 2-9, and 11-15 also each contain the limitation:

said plurality of input trips including a disconnect trip indicating that said central control unit has failed;

The disconnect trip of the present invention does not indicate an integrity failure based upon the various and elaborate wiring and connections of the remote devices to the central process. Rather, the disconnect trip of the present invention simply informs the local units that the central control unit has failed. Nowhere in Launey et. al is such a feature taught or suggested. Therefore, in accordance with MPEP 2142 and 2143.03, the Applicant submits that a *prima facie* case for obviousness has not been made. As such, the Applicant submits that Claims 2-9, and 11-15 should be allowable.

Regarding Claim 2:

Nowhere in Launey et. al is the following limitation taught or suggested:

said plurality of programmable responses including a warning output signal sent from said local unit to said central control unit which indicates the presence of a local emergency.

Therefore, in accordance with MPEP 2142 and 2143.03, the Applicant submits that a *prima facie* case for obviousness has not been made. As such, the Applicant submits that Claim 2 should be allowable.

Regarding Claim 3:

Nowhere in Launey et. al is the following limitation taught or suggested:

said warning output signal being sent when a loss of local unit power is detected.

Therefore, in accordance with MPEP 2142 and 2143.03, the Applicant submits that a *prima facie* case for obviousness has not been made. As such, the Applicant submits that Claim 3 should be allowable.

Regarding Claim 4:

Nowhere in Launey et. al is the following limitation taught or suggested:
said plurality of input trips including a smoke detector.

Therefore, in accordance with MPEP 2142 and 2143.03, the Applicant submits that a *prima facie* case for obviousness has not been made. As such, the Applicant submits that Claim 4 should be allowable.

Regarding Claim 5:

Nowhere in Launey et. al is the following limitation taught or suggested:
said plurality of input trips including an earthquake detector.

Therefore, in accordance with MPEP 2142 and 2143.03, the Applicant submits that a *prima facie* case for obviousness has not been made. As such, the Applicant submits that Claim 5 should be allowable.

Regarding Claim 6:

Nowhere in Launey et. al is the following limitation taught or suggested:
said plurality of input trips including a motion detector.

Therefore, in accordance with MPEP 2142 and 2143.03, the Applicant submits that a *prima facie* case for obviousness has not been made. As such, the Applicant submits that Claim 6 should be allowable.

Regarding Claim 7:

Nowhere in Launey et. al is the following limitation taught or suggested:
said plurality of input trips including a noxious or poisonous gas detector.

Therefore, in accordance with MPEP 2142 and 2143.03, the Applicant submits that a *prima facie* case for obviousness has not been made. As such, the Applicant submits that Claim 7 should be allowable.

Regarding Claim 8:

Nowhere in Launey et. al is the following limitation taught or suggested:
said plurality of programmable responses including illumination of an emergency light.

Therefore, in accordance with MPEP 2142 and 2143.03, the Applicant submits that a *prima facie* case for obviousness has not been made. As such, the Applicant submits that Claim 8 should be allowable.

Regarding Claim 9:

Nowhere in Launey et. al is the following limitation taught or suggested:
said plurality of programmable responses including illumination of a strobe light.

Therefore, in accordance with MPEP 2142 and 2143.03, the Applicant submits that a *prima facie* case for obviousness has not been made. As such, the Applicant submits that Claim 9 should be allowable.

Regarding Claim 11:

Nowhere in Launey et. al is the following limitation taught or suggested:
said audio message being a verbal message that is broadcast in a plurality of different languages.

Therefore, in accordance with MPEP 2142 and 2143.03, the Applicant submits that a *prima facie* case for obviousness has not been made. As such, the Applicant submits that Claim 11 should be allowable.

Regarding Claim 12:

Nowhere in Launey et. al is the following limitation taught or suggested:

under non-emergency conditions, said central control unit broadcasting preselected audio to each of said local units.

Therefore, in accordance with MPEP 2142 and 2143.03, the Applicant submits that a *prima facie* case for obviousness has not been made. As such, the Applicant submits that Claim 12 should be allowable.

Regarding Claim 13:

Nowhere in Launey et. al is the following limitation taught or suggested:

when one of said input trips is activated, said preselected audio is disconnected

Therefore, in accordance with MPEP 2142 and 2143.03, the Applicant submits that a *prima facie* case for obviousness has not been made. As such, the Applicant submits that Claim 13 should be allowable.

Regarding Claim 14:

Nowhere in Launey et. al is the following limitation taught or suggested:

under emergency conditions, said central control unit allows for broadcasting at least one of (1) preselected audio, and (2) live voice instructions to at least one of said local units, of which no local trip has been tripped.

Therefore, in accordance with MPEP 2142 and 2143.03, the Applicant submits that a *prima facie* case for obviousness has not been made. As such, the Applicant submits that Claim 14 should be allowable.

Regarding Claim 15:

Claim 15 contains each of the limitations of Claims 2-9, and 11-14 as have been addressed above.

Therefore, in accordance with MPEP 2142 and 2143.03, the Applicant submits that a *prima facie* case for obviousness has not been made. As such, the Applicant submits that Claim 15 should be allowable.

A fee of \$55 for a one month extension of time is enclosed.

The Applicant assumes that the drawings are acceptable as submitted.

In view of the above, the Applicant respectfully requests allowance of all the claims remaining in the application.

Respectfully submitted,



Ted Masters, Reg. No. 36,209
23344 8th St.
Newhall, CA 91321